



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,416	11/28/2003	Visvesvaraya A. Pentakota	TI-37260	7395
23494	7590	08/09/2004	EXAMINER	
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED			JEAN PIERRE, PEGUY	
P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999			ART UNIT	
DALLAS, TX 75265			PAPER NUMBER	
			2819	

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

lhw

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/722,416	Applicant(s) PENTAKOTA ET AL.	
	Examiner Peguy JeanPierre	Art Unit 2819	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/28/2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 1-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, line 5, the term “ a feedback amplifier” is confusing. A feedback capacitor across an amplifier is shown and described in the specification; line 15 the term” connecting the feedback amplifier across said feedback amplifier...) is unclear; the same confusion is present in claim 22;

In claim 4, line 2, the term “the gain of ...” lacks antecedent basis; in addition the term “a first stage is confusing. It seems to refer to the first stage recited in claim 1, line 4; the same problem is present in claims 15, 25, and 37;

In claim 5, line 1, the term “the elements” is broad and unclear. The claim recites a plurality of steps; in addition, the claim is confusing because it recites that the plurality of input capacitors are connected to a constant bias voltage in both phases of the clock cycles; It is not clear whether the capacitors were disconnected then connected again to the bias voltage; moreover, the claim does not recite where the second signal comes from; The same confusion is present in claim 16, 26, and 38;

In claim 6, line 1, the term “ a sub-code...” is confusing. It seems to refer to a sub-code recited in claim 1 line 6;

In claim 9, lines 1-2, the terms “INP and INM” must be spelled out once to avoid any confusion; the same confusion is present in claims 21, 31, 42;

Art Unit: 2819

In claim 10 line 6, the term "a first stage " is unclear. It seems to refer to the first stage recited in the preamble; lines 23 and 25, the term " feedback amplifier" is confusing, a feedback capacitor is shown and described in the specification; the same confusion appears in claim 32;

In claim 11, lines 5 and 8, the term "a feedback amplifier" is confusing;

In claim 15 line 2 the term " the gain" lacks antecedent basis; in addition, the term " a first stage" is confusing. It seems to refer to the first stage recited in claim 10;

In claims 19 and 29 the expression in side the parentheses" is not considered a limitation; consequently, the claims are confusing because they do not state what is being added to the digital code output.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. Claims 1-43 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Jones, III (USP 6,489,914), Yu (USP 6,184,809), Johnson et al. (USP 6,169,502), Kuttner (USP 5,825,316), Lee (USP 54,510,789) disclose method for calibrating ADC converters.

Art Unit: 2819

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peguy JeanPierre whose telephone number is (571) 272-1803. The examiner fax phone number is (571) 273-1803.


Peguy JeanPierre
Primary Examiner